

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached drawing includes changes to FIG. 2. The sheet containing FIG. 2 replaces the original sheet including FIG. 2. An annotated sheet and a replacement sheet are provided.

In the Office Action on page 2, the Examiner objected to the drawings. In order to overcome these objections, replacement FIG. 2 is submitted herewith. In FIG. 2, the elements --internet-- labeled as 250, and a --second line-- labeled as 270, are illustrated. The element --first line-- is labeled as 260. Approval of these changes to the Drawings is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the drawings, specification, and claims 20 and 21 are amended. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended drawings, specification, and claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 20 and 21 are amended for form without narrowing the claims within the meaning of *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 56 USPQ2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Claims 20 and 21 are pending and under consideration.

PAGE 3: OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) and contends that "the Internet and the 1st and 2nd lines must be shown." (Action at page 3).

FIG. 2 is amended herein to illustrate elements --internet-- labeled as 250, and --second line-- labeled as 270. The element --first line-- is labeled as 260. Respective paragraphs are appropriately amended. Approval of these changes to the drawings and specification are respectfully requested.

Further, the Examiner questions as to "whether the telephone and plug-in are in series or in parallel. The drawing appears to show them in series. Is this correct?"

Applicants point out to the Examiner that the "telephone plug-in 230 connects to the telephone 240 with the selected telephone number using the same telephone line as that used to connect the information terminal with web browser 200 to the web server 210." (See, for example, page 6, starting at line 14). Such a connection from the telephone plug-in 230 to the telephone does not preclude, as understood in the art, other possible connections of the telephone or the telephone plug-in to other items.

PAGES 3-5: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 20-21

The Examiner rejects claims 20- 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Wood et al. (U.S.P. 6,091,808) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Wood et al. in view of Shachar et al. (U.S.P. 5,764,736).

The rejections are traversed.

Claim 20 recites a system for dialing a telephone number retrieved via a first telephone line and the internet from a remote web server including "a web browser determines whether the selected telephone number is defined with a predetermined link syntax, and if the if the selected telephone number is defined with the predetermined link syntax, the telephone plug-in

automatically dials the selected telephone number using the second telephone line independently of the web server, to set up a communication channel through the telephone, the communication channel being independent of the telephone plug-in, the first telephone line and the internet.

Claim 21 recites a system for dialing a telephone number retrieved via a telephone line and the internet from a remote web server including "if the web browser determines that the selected telephone number is defined with a predetermined link syntax, the telephone plug-in automatically dials the selected telephone number independently of the web server, to set up a communication channel through the telephone, the communication channel being independent of the telephone plug-in, the web server, and the internet."

Applicants submit that these features are not discussed by the cited art, alone or in combination.

For example, none of the cited art, alone or in combination discusses that "a web browser determines whether the selected telephone number is defined with a predetermined link syntax."

Further, the Examiner has not cited any discussion in the art relied on regarding this feature.

Rather, Wood, in fact, discusses (see, for example col. 6, lines 50-5) that "a number can be entered and optionally edited by the subscriber by typing at the network browser."

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974).

Conclusion

Since all features are not discussed by the cited art, alone or in combination and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 20-21 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 23, 2008

By:

Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501



FIG. 2

